



PROPOSAL EVALUATION

IRWM Grant Program – Local Groundwater Assistance, FY 2012-2013

Applicant	Joshua Basin Water District	County	San Bernardino
Project Title	JBWD – Water Recharge Monitoring Well Project	Grant Request	\$ 250,000.00
		Total Project Cost	\$ 250,000.00

Project Description: The Joshua Basin Water District (JBWD) proposal tracks the movement of recharge water within the basin to optimize pumping and ameliorate overdraft conditions, monitors recharge impact on nitrate concentrations, and expands the region's overall understanding of water recharge and movement for optimized groundwater management.

Evaluation Summary:

Scoring Criterion	Score
GWMP or Program	5
Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed	5
Work Plan	6
Budget	1
Schedule	3
QA/QC	2
Past Performance	2
Geographical Balance	0
Total Score	24

- **GWMP or Program:** The applicant has an adopted GWMP. A copy of the Plan is included in the application.
- **Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed:** The criterion is fully addressed and well documented. This proposal is for the construction of a 1,000-foot deep monitoring well that will track the movement of recharge water and monitor recharge impact on nitrate concentrations. The project supports the goals and objectives of the GWMP by addressing the issue of overdraft and understanding groundwater movement in the basin. The ongoing monitoring or maintenance will be funded through General Revenue District funds. The applicant demonstrates collaboration with local agencies and USGS.
- **Work Plan:** The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient. The work plan does not provide sufficient details in the task descriptions and is not Agreement-Ready. For example it is unclear in Task 5.0 who the audience is for the kick-off meeting; and what meetings will be held and who is the target audience for Task 5.2? The work plan does not address how information gained by the proposed project will be disseminated to the public and other interested stakeholders.
- **Budget:** The criterion is minimally addressed and documentation is incomplete and insufficient. The applicant is requesting \$250,000 in grant funding with no cost share to install a monitoring well and 3-5 piezometers. A very simple budget was presented for five tasks that total \$250,000. The budget is inconsistent with the tasks presented in the work plan. There is no narrative in this section that explains how the budget was derived, assumptions made, and no supporting documentation is included as required by the PSP.
- **Schedule:** The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient. The schedule is not consistent with the tasks provided in the work plan, Project administration (submittal of progress reports, meetings, etc) is not addressed in the schedule and the applicant does not state what measures would be taken if a delay were to occur.
- **QA/QC:** The criterion is marginally addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient. The Quality Assurance plan only discusses measures of tracking progress in terms of meetings, quarter reports and project completion report. Applicant does not provide construction standards for the monitoring well, calibration of piezometers, or personnel qualifications that would provide QA/QC measures for each task as required by the PSP.



PROPOSAL EVALUATION

IRWM Grant Program – Local Groundwater Assistance, FY 2012-2013

- **Past Performance:** The applicant has received four grants, of which one has been completed (grant was through USBR). JBWD is currently in the process of getting a Prop 84 Implementation Grant agreement executed through MWA. It also received money from USDA for a rural water system. Although the District states that grant reporting and invoicing requirements were fully complied with, no documentation is provided.